arXiv:1410.6916v7 [math.CO] 25 Aug 2015

Distance magic labeling in complete 4-partite graphs

Daniel Kotlar
Department of Computer Science, Tel-Hai College, Upper Galilee, Israel

Abstract

Let G be a complete k-partite simple undirected graph with parts of sizes $p_1 \leqslant p_2 \cdots \leqslant p_k$. Let $P_j = \sum_{i=1}^{j} p_i$ for $j = 1, \ldots, k$. It is conjectured that G has distance magic labeling if and only if $\sum_{i=1}^{P_j}(n-i+1) \geqslant j\binom{n+1}{2}/k$ for all $j = 1, \ldots, k$. The conjecture is proved for $k = 4$, extending earlier results for $k = 2, 3$.

1 Introduction

Let $G = (V, E)$ be a finite, simple, undirected graph of order n. Denoting $[n] = \{1, 2, \ldots, n\}$, a *distance magic labeling* of G [6] (or *sigma labeling* [4]) is a bijection $f : V \to [n]$ such that for all $x \in V$,

$$\sum_{y \in N(x)} f(y) = \mathbf{c} \tag{1}$$

for a constant $\mathbf{c}$, independent of x ($N(x)$ is the set of vertices adjacent to x).

Miller, Rodger and Simanjuntak [6] showed that if G is the $2kr$-regular multipartite graph $H \times \overline{K_{2k}}$ then G has a distance magic labeling ($\overline{K_{2k}}$ is the complement of the graph K_{2k}). They also showed that for the complete symmetric multipartite graph $H_{n,p}$ with p parts and n vertices in each part, $H_{n,p}$ has a distance magic labeling if and only if either n is even or both n and p are odd. In addition, they gave necessary and sufficient conditions for a complete multipartite graph $K_{p_1,p_2,\ldots,p_k}$ (where the parts are not necessarily of equal sizes) to have a distance magic labeling for $k = 2, 3$. The result for $k = 2$ also appears in [4]. For more results and surveys on distance magic labeling see [2, 3, 5].

It has been observed that the problem of characterizing the complete multipartite graphs which have a distance magic labeling is equivalent to a problem on partitions of $[n]$: let $V = V_1 \cup V_2 \cup \cdots \cup V_k$ be the parts of $G = K_{p_1,p_2,\ldots,p_k}$ with sizes $p_1, p_2, \ldots, p_k$, respectively, so that $p_1 + p_2 + \cdots + p_k = n$. Then, G has a distance magic labeling if and only if there exists a bijection $f : V \to [n]$ such that for all $j = 1, \ldots, k$, $\sum_{i=1, i\neq j} \sum_{x \in V_i} f(x) = \mathbf{c}$, where $\mathbf{c}$ is a constant. This is equivalent to $\mathbf{c} = \binom{n+1}{2} - \sum_{x \in V_j} f(x)$ for all $j = 1, \ldots, k$, or $\sum_{x \in V_j} f(x) = \binom{n+1}{2}/k$ for all $j = 1, \ldots, k$. Denote $s^{n,k} = \binom{n+1}{2}/k$. The problem can be reformulated as follows:

Problem 1. Let n, k and $p_1, \ldots, p_k$ be positive integers such that $p_1 + \cdots + p_k = n$ and $s^{n,k}$ is an integer. When is it possible to find a partition of the set $[n]$ into k subsets of sizes $p_1, \ldots, p_k$, respectively, such that the sum of the elements in each subset is $s^{n,k}$?

Anholcer, Cichacz and Peterin [1] related this problem to a different problem in vertex labeling: let G be the graph obtained from the cycle C_k by replacing every vertex v_i by a clique $K[v_i]$ of some order p_i, and joining all the vertices of each $K[v_i]$ with all the vertices of $K[v_j]$ whenever v_j is a neighbor of v_i in C_k. Then, consider the problem of finding a *closed distance magic labeling* of G, that is, a magic labeling where the sum in (1) includes $f(x)$. Clearly, if the partition in Problem 1 is solved for k, then G has a closed distance magic labeling. A necessary condition for such a partition to exist was observed in [1]:

Observation 1.1. Assume the setup of Problem 1 with $p_1, \ldots, p_k$ given in a non-decreasing order. Let $P_j = \sum_{i=1}^{j} p_i$ for $j = 1, \ldots, k$. If the mentioned partition of $[n]$ exists, then

$$\sum_{i=1}^{P_j}(n-i+1) \geqslant j s^{n,k} \quad \text{for all} \quad j = 1, \ldots, k. \tag{2}$$

It is conjectured here (Conjecture 1.5) that this condition is sufficient. Before formulating the conjecture we shall need some notation and definitions:

Definition 1.2. Let n be a positive integer and let $\mathcal{P} = \{p_1, p_2, \cdots, p_k\}$ be a set of positive integers satisfying $\sum_{i=1}^{k} p_i = n$. We say that a partition $\mathcal{A} = \{A_1, A_2, \ldots, A_k\}$ of $[n]$ *implements* the sequence $\{p_i\}_{i=1}^{k}$, if there is a bijection $f : \mathcal{A} \to \mathcal{P}$ such that $|A_i| = f(A_i)$ for all $i = 1, \ldots, k$.

Definition 1.3. For any set of integers A, the *sum* of A, denoted $S(A)$, is the sum of the elements in A.

Definition 1.4. Let n and k be positive integer such that $s^{n,k}$ is an integer. We say that the partition $\mathcal{A} = \{A_1, A_2, \ldots, A_k\}$ of $[n]$ is *equitable* if $S(A_i) = s^{n,k}$ for all $i = 1, \ldots, k$.

Conjecture 1.5. *Let $k < n$ be positive integers such that $s^{n,k}$ is an integer. Let $1 < p_1 \leqslant p_2 \leqslant \cdots \leqslant p_k$ be positive integers such that $\sum_{i=1}^{k} p_i = n$. There exists an equitable partition of $[n]$ implementing $\{p_i\}_{i=1}^{k}$ if and only if (2) holds.*

This conjecture was in fact proved in [6] for $k = 2, 3$. The case $k = 2$ was independently proved in [4]. The main result in this paper is:

Theorem 1.6. *Conjecture 1.5 holds for $k = 4$.*

The approach used for proving Theorem 1.6 also provides simple proofs for the cases $k = 2, 3$ (Remarks 2.8 and 2.12).

Thus, the k-partite complete graphs for which a magic distance labeling exits are characterized for $k \leqslant 4$. This also solves the above mentioned closed distance magic labeling problem from [1] for $k = 4$.

Note that the case where $p_1 = 1$ is left out in Conjecture 1.5, as this case is different and straightforward. Suppose $p_1 = 1$. In order for a partition which implements $\{p_i\}_{i=1}^{k}$ to be equitable, the set of size 1 must be $\{n\}$, and thus, $n = s^{n,k}$, which is equivalent to $k = (n+1)/2$. Since there can be only one set of size 1 in an equitable partition, all the other sets must be of size 2. Thus, we can partition the remaining $[n-1]$ into $k-1$ pairs, in the obvious way, to get an equitable partition.

2 Preliminary results and notation

We first introduce some notation and definitions and prove some preliminary results for general k. We assume that k and n are such that $s^{n,k}$ is an integer.

Notation 2.1. For a partition $\mathcal{A} = \{A_1, A_2, \ldots, A_k\}$ of $[n]$, we denote $d(\mathcal{A}) = \sum_{i=1}^{k} (S(A_i) - s^{n,k})^2$.

For any set A and an element x we use the notation $A - x$ for $A \setminus \{x\}$ and $A \cup x$ for $A \cup \{x\}$.

Notation 2.2. Let $\mathcal{A} = \{A_1, A_2, \ldots, A_k\}$ be a partition of $[n]$ and suppose $a \in A_i$ and $b \in A_j$, where $a < b$ and $i \neq j$. We shall denote by $\chi_{a,b}$ the operator that acts on $\mathcal{A}$ by exchanging a and b between A_i and A_j. The result is a new partition $\chi_{a,b}(\mathcal{A})$, which we shall denote $\mathcal{A}_{a,b}$, where A_i is replaced by $A_i - a \cup b$ and A_j is replaced by $A_j - b \cup a$.

Observation 2.3. Let $\mathcal{A} = \{A_1, A_2, \ldots, A_k\}$ be partition of $[n]$. Suppose $a \in A_i$ and $b \in A_j$ where $i \neq j$. Then, $d(\mathcal{A}_{a,b}) = d(\mathcal{A})$ if $b - a = S(A_j) - S(A_i)$, $d(\mathcal{A}_{a,b}) > d(\mathcal{A})$ if $b - a > S(A_j) - S(A_i)$, and $d(\mathcal{A}_{a,b}) < d(\mathcal{A})$ if $b - a < S(A_j) - S(A_i)$.

Proof. Let $t = b - a$ and $u = S(A_j) - S(A_i)$. We have $d(\mathcal{A}_{a,b}) = d(\mathcal{A}) + 2t(t - u)$. □

Definition 2.4. For a given sequence $\mathcal{P} = \{p_i\}_{i=1}^{k}$ satisfying $\sum_{i=1}^{k} p_i = n$, let $d_{\min}^{\mathcal{P}}$ be the minimal value of $d(\mathcal{A})$ over all partitions of $[n]$ which implement $\mathcal{P}$. A partition $\mathcal{A}$ implementing $\mathcal{P}$, such that $d(\mathcal{A}) = d_{\min}^{\mathcal{P}}$ will be called a *minimal partition*.

Definition 2.5. Let $\mathcal{A}$ be a partition of $[n]$ and let $A \in \mathcal{A}$. We say that A is *low* if $S(A) < s^{n,k}$, A is *high* if $S(A) > s^{n,k}$, and A is *exact* if $S(A) = s^{n,k}$.

Observation 2.6. Suppose there is no equitable partition of $[n]$ implementing $\{p_i\}_{i=1}^{k}$ and let $\mathcal{A}$ be a minimal partition. Then there is no $c \in [n]$ such that c is in a low set of $\mathcal{A}$ and $c + 1$ is in a high set.

Proof. Assume the contrary, so that $c \in A_i$ and $c + 1 \in A_j$ where A_i is a low set and A_j is a high set. We have $S(A_j) - S(A_i) > 1$. So, $d(\mathcal{A}_{c,c+1}) < d(\mathcal{A})$, by Observation 2.3, contradicting the minimality of $\mathcal{A}$. □

Lemma 2.7. *Let $\mathcal{P} = \{p_i\}_{i=1}^k$ be such that $\sum_{i=1}^k p_i = n$ and satisfies (2). Suppose there is no equitable partition implementing $\mathcal{P}$ and let $\mathcal{A}$ be a minimal partition of $[n]$ implementing $\mathcal{P}$. Then, there exists a number t in a low set of $\mathcal{A}$ such that $t+1$ is in an exact set of $\mathcal{A}$ and there exists a number s in an exact set of $\mathcal{A}$ such that $s+1$ in a high set of $\mathcal{A}$.*

Proof. Let $\mathcal{A}^l$ and A^e be the collections of low and exact sets of $\mathcal{A}$, respectively. Let $l = |\mathcal{A}^l|$ and $e = |A^e|$. Let $L = \sum_{A\in\mathcal{A}^l} |A|$ and $E = \sum_{A\in\mathcal{A}^e} |A|$. If all the elements in the low sets of $\mathcal{A}$ are greater than all the elements in the other sets, then $\bigcup_{A\in\mathcal{A}^l} A = \{n-L+1, \ldots, n-1, n\}$, and we have

$$\sum_{i=1}^{P_l}(n-i+1) = \sum_{i=1}^{p_1+\cdots+p_l}(n-i+1) < l \cdot s^{n,k},$$

contradicting (2). So there must be an element t in a low set such that $t+1$ is not in a low set. By Observation 2.6, $t+1$ must be in an exact set. Now, suppose, for contradiction, that all the elements in the low and exact sets of $\mathcal{A}$ are greater than all the elements in the high sets of $\mathcal{A}$. We have

$$\sum_{i=1}^{P_{l+e}}(n-i+1) = \sum_{i=1}^{p_1+\cdots+p_{l+e}}(n-i+1) < (l+e)s^{n,k},$$

contradicting (2). So, there must be s in a low or exact set such that $s+1$ is in a high set. By Observation 2.6, s must be in an exact set. □

Remark 2.8. It follows from Lemma 2.7 that if $\mathcal{P}$ satisfies (2) and there is no equitable partition implementing $\mathcal{P}$, then $k \geqslant 3$. This implies Conjecture 1.5 for $k = 2$.

Lemma 2.9. *Let $\mathcal{P} = \{p_i\}_{i=1}^k$ be such that $\sum_{i=1}^k p_i = n$ and satisfies (2). If there is no equitable partition implementing $\mathcal{P}$, then every minimal partition implementing $\mathcal{P}$ contains at least one exact set, one low set with sum $s^{n,k}-1$, and one high with sum $s^{n,k}+1$.*

Proof. Let $\mathcal{A}$ be a minimal partition implementing $\mathcal{P}$. By Lemma 2.7, there must be a low set X, an exact set Z and a number $a \in X$ such that $a+1 \in Z$ and an exact set W, a high set Y, and a number $b \in W$ such that $b+1 \in Y$. Since $\mathcal{A}$ is minimal, we must have $S(X) = s^{n,k}-1$ and $S(Y) = s^{n,k}+1$, by Observation 2.3. □

In the discussion ahead we shall use diagrams with two horizontal lines. High sets with sum $s^{n,k}+1$ appear above the lines, exact sets appear between the lines, and low sets with sum $s^{n,k}-1$ are drawn below the lines. An arrow points from a number to its successor. For example, Figure 1 illustrates the setup in the proof of Lemma 2.9.



Figure 1

Definition 2.10. We say that two partitions $\mathcal{A}$ and $\mathcal{A}'$ of $[n]$ are *equivalent*, denoted $\mathcal{A} \equiv \mathcal{A}'$, if there exists a bijection $f : \mathcal{A} \to \mathcal{A}'$ such that $S(f(A)) = S(A)$ for all $A \in \mathcal{A}$.

Clearly, if $\mathcal{A} \equiv \mathcal{A}'$, then $d(\mathcal{A}) = d(\mathcal{A}')$.



Figure 2

Lemma 2.11. *If $\mathcal{A}$ is a minimal partition then the configurations illustrated in Figure 2 are not possible, given that $b \neq a+1$ in all figures, $c \neq b+1$ in Figure 2(b), $x \neq b+1$ in Figures 2(c) and 2(e), and $x+2 \neq a$ in Figures 2(d) and 2(e).*

Proof. Suppose the configuration in Figure 2(a) exists. Applying $\chi_{a,a+1}$ we obtain an equivalent partition with b in a low set and $b+1$ in a high set, contradicting Observation 2.6. Suppose the configuration in Figure 2(b) exists. Applying $\chi_{c,c+1}$, the element $b+1$ gets pushed up to the high set and we obtain a configuration as in Figure 2(a). Suppose the configuration in Figure 2(c) or Figure 2(d) exists. Applying $\chi_{x,x+2}$, we obtain an equivalent partition with a configuration as in Figure 2(b). If the Configuration in Figure 2(e) exits, then applying $\chi_{x,x+2}$ yields an equivalent partition with a configuration as in Figure 2(a). □

In general, if $A, B \in \mathcal{A}$, $S(B) = S(A)+1$, $a \in A$ and $a+1 \in B$, then, clearly $\mathcal{A}_{a,a+1} \equiv \mathcal{A}$. Such actions of the form $\chi_{a,a+1}$ will be common in our discussion and we won't always mention the obvious fact that the partitions are equivalent.

Remark 2.12. Let $\mathcal{P} = \{p_1, p_2, p_3\}$ be such that $p_1 + p_2 + p_3 = n$ and satisfies (2) for $k = 3$. Suppose there is no equitable partition implementing $\mathcal{P}$ and let $\mathcal{A}$ be a minimal partition implementing $\mathcal{P}$. By Observation 2.6, Lemma 2.9 and Lemma 2.11(a) we must have the setup illustrated in Figure 3. Note that we may assume that $n \in A_3$ (if $n \in A_2$ we apply $\chi_{t+1,t+2}$ and if $n \in A_1$ we apply $\chi_{t+1,t+2} \circ \chi_{t,t+1}$). Let s be the maximal element in $A_2 - (t+1)$. Since $s \neq n$ and $n \notin A_1$ we must have $s+1 \in A_3$, by Observation 2.6. But this yields a configuration as in Lemma 2.11(a). Thus, Conjecture 1.5 holds for $k = 3$.



Figure 3

3 Some lemmas for the case $k = 4$

Lemma 3.1. *Let $\mathcal{P} = \{p_i\}_{i=1}^4$ be such that $\sum_{i=1}^4 p_i = n$ and satisfies (2). If there is no equitable partition of $[n]$ implementing $\mathcal{P}$, then every minimal partition implementing $\mathcal{P}$ has one low set with sum $s^{n,4} - 1$, one high set with sum $s^{n,4} + 1$, and two exact sets.*

Proof. By Lemma 2.9 there is one low set and one high set with the indicated properties, and one exact set. Since the sum of all the elements is $4s^{n,4}$, the fourth set must be exact. □

Definition 3.2. Let $\mathcal{A}$ be a partition of $[n]$ implementing the sequence $\{p_i\}_{i=1}^k$ and assume $\mathcal{A}$ is not equitable. We define the *width* of $\mathcal{A}$, denoted $\omega(\mathcal{A})$, as the minimal value of $y-x$ over all $x, y \in [n]$ such that $y > x$ and such that y is in a high set of $\mathcal{A}$ and x is in a low set. If there are no such x and y we define $\omega(\mathcal{A}) = \infty$.

Lemma 3.3. *Let $\mathcal{P} = \{p_i\}_{i=1}^4$ be such that $\sum_{i=1}^4 p_i = n$ and satisfies (2) for $k = 4$. Suppose there is no equitable partition of $[n]$ implementing $\mathcal{P}$. Then, there exists a minimal partition of $[n]$ with finite width.*

Proof. Let $\mathcal{A} = \{A_1, \ldots, A_4\}$ be a minimal partition of $[n]$ implementing $\{p_i\}_{i=1}^4$ and assume $\omega(\mathcal{A}) = \infty$. We shall show that there is an equivalent partition with finite width. By Lemma 3.1, we may assume that $S(A_1) = s^{n,4} - 1$, $S(A_2) = S(A_3) = s^{n,4}$ and $S(A_4) = s^{n,4} + 1$. By Lemma 2.7 there exist $a \in A_1$ such that $a+1 \in A_2 \cup A_3$, and $b \in A_2 \cup A_3$ such that $b+1 \in A_4$. We may assume that $a+1 \in A_2$. If $b \in A_2$, then, by Lemma 2.11(a), we must have $b = a+1$. But then $\omega(\mathcal{A}) \leqslant 2$, contradicting our assumption. So, we must have $b \in A_3$. If there exist $z < w$ such that $z \in A_2$ and $w \in A_4$, then $z \neq a+1$, since $\omega(\mathcal{A}) = \infty$. Applying $\chi_{a,a+1}$ will yield an equivalent partition with finite width, since it has z in a low set and w in a high set. If there are $z < w$ such that $z \in A_1$ and $w \in A_3$, then $w \neq b$, since $\omega(\mathcal{A}) = \infty$, and applying $\chi_{b,b+1}$ will yield another equivalent partition with finite width. Thus, there must exist $z < w$ such that $z \in A_2$ and $w \in A_3$ (otherwise, all the elements of $A_1 \cup A_2$ are greater than all the elements in $A_3 \cup A_4$, contradicting (2)). If $w = b$, then $z < b+1 \in A_4$ and we have already considered such a setting. So we assume $w \neq b$. In this case we can apply $\chi a, a+1 \circ \chi_{b,b+1}$ and obtain an equivalent partition with w in the high set and z in the low set, and thus, of finite width. □

Lemma 3.4. *Let $\mathcal{A} = \{X, Y, Z, W\}$ be a minimal partition of $[n]$ implementing $\{p_i\}_{i=1}^4$, of minimal width among all such minimal partitions. Assume that $S(X) = s^{n,4} - 1, S(Y) = s^{n,4} + 1$ and $S(Z) = S(W) = s^{n,4}$. Let $x \in X$ and $y \in Y$ satisfy $y - x = \omega(\mathcal{A})$. Suppose $x+1 \in A$ and $y-1 \in B$, where $A, B \in \{Z, W\}$. Then*

(i) $y - x = 2$ *or 3, and* $y - x = 2$ *if and only if* $A = B$.

(ii) $A - (x+1)$ *contains no element* a *such that* $a - 1 \in X$

(iii) $A - (x+1)$ *contains no element* a *such that* $a + 1 \in (X - x)$.

(iv) $B - (y-1)$ *contains no element* b *such that* $b + 1 \in Y$

(v) $B - (y-1)$ *contains no element* b *such that* $b - 1 \in (Y - y)$.

(vi) If $A = B$, *then* $Y - y$ *contains no element* c *such that* $c + 1 \in X - x$.

Figure 4 indicates in dotted lines the illegal configurations of (ii)-(vi) for the two cases implied by (i). Note that in Figure 4(b) the cases (ii) and (iv) are already known from Lemma 2.11(a).



Figure 4

Proof. First note that $\mathcal{A}$ exists by Lemma 3.3. (i) The existence of $z \in A$ satisfying $x+1 < z < y$ is not possible since z would be in the low set of $\mathcal{A}_{x,x+1}$ while y is in the high set, contradicting the minimality of $\omega(\mathcal{A})$. Similarly, the existence of $w \in B$ such that $x < w < y-1$ would imply that w is in the high set of $\mathcal{A}_{y-1,y}$ and x in the low set. Again, a contradiction. Thus, $y - x \leqslant 3$. If $x+1$ and $y-1$ are in the same set, then they are equal, by Lemma 2.11(a), and in this case $y - x = 2$.

Now, let $a \in A - (x+1)$. (ii) If $a - 1 \in X$, then $\mathcal{A}_{a,a-1}$ has $x+1$ in a low set and y in a high set, contradicting the minimality of $\omega(\mathcal{A})$. (iii) If $a + 1 \in X - x$ we apply $\chi_{x,x+1}$ and obtain a setup as in (ii). The proofs of (iv) and (v) are similar.

(vi) Suppose such $c \in Y - y$ exists. Note that $\mathcal{A}_{x,x+2} \equiv \mathcal{A}$, but now c is in the low set and $c+1$ is in the high set, contradicting Observation 2.6. □

Lemma 3.5. *Let $\mathcal{A} = \{A_i\}_{i=1}^4$ be a minimal partition of $[n]$ implementing $\{p_i\}_{i=1}^4$, of minimal width among all such minimal partitions. Then, the configurations illustrated in Figure 5 are not possible, assuming $x+2 \neq d$ (Figures 5(d) and 5(f)) and $x \neq d+2$ (Figures 5(e) and 5(f)).*



Figure 5

Proof. Assume the configuration in Figure 5(a) exists. Since there is symmetry between the roles of x and d, we may assume that $x > d$. Assume there exists $c \neq n$ in $A_2 - (x+1)$ such that $c+1 \notin A_2$. We have $c+1 \notin A_1 - x$ (Lemma 3.4(iii)), $c+1 \notin A_3$ (Lemma 2.11(b)) and $c+1 \notin A_4$ (Lemma 2.11(a)).

Thus, we must have $c+1 = x$. Let $k \geqslant 0$ be minimal such that $c-k \in A_2$ but $c-k-1 \notin A_2$ (assuming there exists such k) and denote $u = c - k$. We have, $u - 1 \notin A_1$, by Lemma 3.4(ii), and $u - 1 \notin A_4$, by Lemma 3.4(v). If $u - 1 \in A_3$ it contradicts Lemma 2.11(b). We conclude that such k does not exist.

Thus, if A_2 contains any element smaller than x, it must contain $\{1, 2, \ldots, x-1\}$. This is impossible, since $d < x$. Hence, such c does not exist and we must have that $A_2 = \{x+1, n-l, \ldots, n\}$ for some $l \geqslant 0$. Let $u = n - l$. As in the previous paragraph, $u - 1 \notin A_1 \cup (A_4 - (x+2)) \cup A_3$. So, we must have $u - 1 = x + 2$. That is, $A_2 = \{x+1, x+3, \ldots, n\}$.

Using a similar argument as for A_2 above we conclude that $A_3 = \{1, 2, \ldots, d-1, d+1\}$. Thus, $A_1 \cup A_4 = \{d, d+2, \ldots, x, x+2\}$. Since $d+2 \in A_4$ and $x \in A_1$, there must exist $a \in A_4$ such that $a + 1 \in A_1$. This would contradict Lemma 3.4(vi), unless $a = d+2$ and $a+1 = x$. In this case we must have $A_1 = \{x, d\}$ and $A_4 = \{x+2, d+2\}$. Hence, $S(A_1) = x + d$ and $S(A_4) = x + d + 4$. This yields a contradiction since $S(A_1) = S(A_4) - 2$. We conclude that a configuration as in Figure 5(a) is not possible.

Now, if a configuration as in Figure 5(b) exists, applying $\chi_{x,x+1}$ yields an equivalent partition with a configuration similar to the one in Figure 5(a). If a configuration as in Figure 5(c) exists, applying $\chi_{x+1,x+2}$ yields a configuration similar to the one in Figure 5(a). If a configuration as in Figure 5(d) exists, applying $\chi_{x,x+2}$ yields an equivalent partition with a configuration similar to the one in Figure 5(c). If a configuration as in Figure 5(e) exists, applying $\chi_{x,x+2}$ yields a configuration similar to the one in Figure 5(b). Finally, If a configuration as in Figure 5(f) exists, applying $\chi_{x,x+2}$ yields a configuration similar to the one in Figure 5(a). □

4 Proof of Theorem 1.6

We assume, for contradiction, that $d_{\min}^{\mathcal{P}} > 0$ for the given $\{p_i\}_{i=1}^4$. Let $\mathcal{A} = \{A_1, A_2, A_3, A_4\}$ be a minimal partition of $[n]$ implementing $\{p_i\}_{i=1}^4$, such that $\omega(\mathcal{A})$ is minimal among all such minimal partitions. By Lemma 3.1, we may assume that $S(A_1) = s^{n,4} - 1$, $S(A_2) = S(A_3) = s^{n,3}$ and $S(A_4) = s^{n,4} + 1$. Let

$x \in A_1$ and $y \in A_4$ be such that $y - x = \omega(\mathcal{A})$. We may assume that $x+1 \in A_2$. By Lemma 3.4(i), there are only two cases to consider: $y - x = 2$ and $y - x = 3$.

First assume $y - x = 2$. That is, $x \in A_1, x + 1 \in A_2$ and $x + 2 \in A_4$. It will be convenient to notice that we have the same setup as in Figure 4(b), with $X = A_1$, $A = B = A_2$ and $Y = A_4$. Let $B_1 = A_1 - x$, $B_2 = A_2 - (x + 1)$, $B_3 = A_3$ and $B_4 = A_4 - (x + 2)$. We may make two assumptions:

Assumption 1: $n \notin A_1$

Assumption 2: $\max_{A_2} < \max_{A_4}$.

(If $n \in A_1$ we apply $\chi_{x,x+2}$, which ensures both assumptions. If $n \notin A_1$ and Assumption 2 does not hold, we apply $\chi_{x+1,x+2}$.)

Let m_i be the maximal elements in B_i for $i = 1, \ldots, 4$. By our assumptions, $m_1, m_2 < n$. By Lemma 2.11(a), $m_2 + 1 \notin A_4$ and by Lemma 3.4(iii), $m_2 + 1 \notin B_1$. Thus, either $m_2 + 1 \in A_3$ or $m_2 + 1 = x$. Suppose $m_2 + 1 \in A_3$. By Assumption 2, there exists $k \geqslant 1$ such that $m_2 + k \in A_3$ and $m_2 + k + 1 \notin A_3$ (otherwise $m_2 + 1, m_2 + 2, \ldots, n$ are all in A_3 and m_2 would be larger than any element of A_4). Suppose $m_2 + k + 1 \in A_4$. If $k = 1$ it contradicts Lemma 3.5(b), and if $k > 1$ it contradicts Lemma 2.11(b). Now, suppose $m_2 + k + 1 \in A_1$ and $m_2 + k + 1 \neq x$. If $k = 1$ it contradicts Lemma 3.5(e), and if $k > 1$ we contradict Lemma 2.11(c). Thus, $m_2 + k + 1 = x$ for some $k \geqslant 0$. In any case we have $x - 1 \in A_2 \cup A_3$. In particular, $x - 1 \notin A_1$.

Now, by Lemma 2.11(a), $m_1 + 1 \notin A_2$, and by Observation 2.6, $m_1 + 1 \notin A_4$. It follows that $m_1 + 1 \in A_3$. Suppose there exists $l \geqslant 1$ such that $m_1 + l \in A_3$ and $m_1 + l + 1 \notin A_3$. Note that $m_1 + l + 1 \neq x$, since we already know that $m_2 + k + 1 = x$. Since m_1 is maximal in $A_1 - x$, we must have $m_1 + l + 1 \in A_2 \cup A_4$. Suppose $m_1 + l + 1 \in A_4$. If $l = 1$, then $m_1 + 2 \in A_4$ and we contradict Lemma 3.5(a). If $l > 1$, then $m_1 + 1 \neq m_1 + l$ and we contradict Lemma 2.11(a). Now, suppose $m_1 + l + 1 \in A_2$. If $l = 1$ it contradicts Lemma 3.5(c). If $l > 1$, it contradicts Lemma 2.11(b). We conclude that $m_1 + 1, \ldots, n \in A_3$ and thus, $m_4 < n$.

We have $m_4 + 1 \notin A_2$, by Assumption 2, and $m_4 + 1 \notin A_1$, by Lemma 3.4(vi) and the fact that $x - 1 \in A_2 \cup A_3$. So, we must have $m_4 + 1 \in A_3$ and there exists $t \geqslant 1$ such that $m_4 + t \in A_3$ and $m_4 + t + 1 \notin A_3$ (since $m_1 + 1, \ldots, n \in A_3$). Clearly, $m_4 + t + 1 \neq x + 2$, so $m_4 + t + 1$ can only be in A_1, by Assumption 2. Now, $m_4 + t + 1 \neq x$, since $m_2 + k + 1 = x$. So, $m_4 + t + 1 \in B_1$. If $t = 1$ it contradicts Lemma 3.5(f), and if $t > 1$, we have a contradiction to Lemma 2.11(e). This concludes the case where $y - x = 2$.

Now assume $y - x = 3$. By Lemma 3.4, we have $x + 1 \in A_2, x + 2 \in A_3$ and $y = x + 3 \in A_4$. It will be convenient to notice that we have a setup similar to the one in Figure 4(a), with $X = A_1$, $A = A_2$, $B = A_3$, $Y = A_4$ and $y = x + 3$. Let $B_1 = A_1 - x, B_2 = A_2 - (x + 1), B_3 = A_3 - (x + 2)$ and $B_4 = A_4 - (x + 3)$.

Let $z \in B_1$ and assume $z \neq n$. We know that $z + 1 \notin A_4$ by Observation 2.6, $z + 1 \notin A_2$ by Lemma 3.4(ii), and $z + 1 \notin A_3$ by Lemma 2.11(a). Thus, $z + 1 \in A_1$. Now, let $z \in B_2$ and $z \neq n$. We have, $z+1 \notin A_4$ by Lemma 2.11(a), and $z+1 \notin B_1$ by Lemma 3.4(iii). Also, $z+1 \notin A_3$, by Lemma 2.11(b). Thus, $z+1 \in B_2$ or $z+1 = x$. It follows that either B_1 or B_2 is equal to $\{t, t+1, \ldots, x-1\}$ for some $t \geqslant 1$ and the other is equal to $\{s, s + 1, \ldots, n\}$ for some $s > x + 3$. We may assume $A_1 = \{x, s, s + 1, \ldots, n\}$ and $A_2 = \{t, t + 1, \ldots, x - 1, x + 1\}$ (by applying $\chi_{x,x+1}$ if necessary).

Let $z > 1$ be an element of B_4. We have $z-1 \notin A_1$ by Observation 2.6, $z-1 \notin A_2$ by Lemma 2.11(a), and $z - 1 \notin A_3$ by Lemma 3.4(iv). Thus, $z - 1 \in A_4$. Let $z > 1$ be an element of B_3. We have $z - 1 \notin A_1$ by Lemma 2.11(a), $z - 1 \notin B_4$ by Lemma 3.4(v), and $z - 1 \notin A_2$, by Lemma 2.11(b). Thus, $z - 1 \in B_3$ or $z - 1 = x + 3$. We conclude that either B_3 or B_4 is equal to $\{1, 2, \ldots, t - 1\}$ and the other is equal to $\{x + 4, \ldots, s - 1\}$ for the same t and s as above. Since none of the A_i's has size 1, we must have that $1 < t \leqslant x - 1$ and $x + 3 < s \leqslant n$. By applying $\chi_{x+2,x+3}$ if necessary, we may assume that $A_3 = \{1, 2, \ldots, t - 1, x + 2\}$ and $A_4 = \{x + 3, x + 4, \ldots, s - 1\}$ (Figure 6(a)).

Note that $s^{n,4} = S(A_4) - 1 \geqslant (x+3) + (x+4) - 1 = 2x+6$. Thus, $|A_2| > 2$, that is, $t < x - 1$. Let $\mathcal{A}'$ be partition consisting of $A'_1 = A_1, A'_2 = A_2 \setminus \{t, x+1\} \cup \{t-1, x+2\}, A'_3 = A_3 \setminus \{t-1, x+2\} \cup \{t, x+1\}$, and $A'_4 = A_4$ (Figure 6(b)). Note that $S(A'_i) = S(A_i)$ for $i = 1, \ldots, 4$, and thus $\mathcal{A}'$ is also minimal with the same minimal width. Since $t < x - 1$, we have $t + 1 \in A'_2$ and we have a contradiction to Lemma 2.11(b). This completes the proof.

□

Remark 4.1. In the case $k = 2$ there is yet another simple proof:



Figure 6

Suppose $p_1 + p_2 = n$, $p_1 \leqslant p_2$ and $\sum_{i=1}^{p_1}(n-i+1) \geqslant s^{n,2}$ (Condition (2)). Consider the following two partitions of $[n]$: $\mathcal{A} = \{A_1, A_2\}$ and $\mathcal{B} = \{B_1, B_2\}$, such that $|A_i| = |B_i| = p_i$, for $i = 1, 2$, $A_1 = \{1, \ldots, p_1\}$ and $B_1 = \{n - p_1 + 1, \ldots, n\}$. We have $|A_1| < s^{n,2}$ since $p_1 \leqslant p_2$ and $|B_1| \geqslant s^{n,2}$ by (2). We show that we can switch from $\mathcal{A}$ to $\mathcal{B}$ by a sequence of operations of the form $\chi_{a,a+1}$. Thus, at some point along the way we must have an equitable partition.

We start with partition $\mathcal{A}$ and apply $\chi_{1,2} \circ \chi_{2,3} \circ \cdots \circ \chi_{p_1-1,p_1} \circ \chi_{p_1,p_1+1}$. This results in the partition consisting of $\{2, 3, \ldots, p_1, p_1 + 1\}$ and $\{1, p_1 + 2, \ldots, n\}$. Then, we apply $\chi_{2,3} \circ \cdots \circ \chi_{p_1+1,p_1+2}$, resulting in $\{3, 4, \ldots, p_1 + 2\}$ and $\{1, 2, p_1 + 3, \ldots, n\}$, and so on. Eventually we arrive at partition $\mathcal{B}$.

It might be possible to generalize this continuity approach to higher k's by applying a higher dimensional continuity technique, such as Sperner's theorem. The problem is to define the right division into $(k-1)$-dimensional simplices.

Acknowledgments

The author thanks the referees for a very thorough reading of the manuscript.

References

[1] M. Anholcer, S. Cichacz, and I. Peterin, *Spectra of graphs and closed distance magic labelings*, A manuscript.

[2] M. Anholcer, S. Cichacz, I. Peterin, and A. Tepeh, *Distance magic labeling and two products of graphs*, Graphs and Combinatorics (2014), 1–12.

[3] S. Arumugam, D. Froncek, and N. Kamatchi, *Distance magic graphs - a survey*, Journal of the Indonesian Mathematical Society (2012), 11–26.

[4] S. Beena, *On $\sum$ and $\sum'$ labelled graphs*, Discrete Mathematics **309** (2009), no. 6, 1783–1787.

[5] J. A. Gallian, *A dynamic survey of graph labeling*, Electronic Journal of Combinatorics **16** (2009), no. 6, 1–219.

[6] M. Miller, C. Rodger, and R. Simanjuntak, *Distance magic labelings of graphs*, Australasian Journal of Combinatorics **28** (2003), 305–315.